

article was labeled in part: "Steriloid * * * The Martin Remedy Co. * * * New York City."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the article consisted of a mixture of alum, boric acid, lead acetate, milk sugar, and a trace of potassium iodide.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that certain statements regarding the therapeutic and curative effects thereof appearing on the labels of the boxes containing the said article and in the accompanying booklet, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for abortion and sterility in cows and other domestic animals, when, in truth and in fact, it contained no ingredients or medicinal agents capable of producing the effects claimed.

On April 21, 1924, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

12263. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. 17 Cans of Olive Oil. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 17888. I. S. no. 8526-v. S. No. W-1432.)

On November 1, 1923, the United States attorney for the district of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 17 cans of olive oil, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., consigned by Deligiannis Bros., Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped from Chicago, Ill., on or about July 17, 1923, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Colorado, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Net Contents One Gallon * * * Pure Olive Oil * * * Universal Brand. Deligiannis Bros. Chicago. U S A"

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Net Contents One Gallon," appearing on the said cans, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, since the net contents of each of the said cans was less than 1 gallon. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was [food] in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On January 4, 1924, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be correctly labeled and sold by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

12264. Adulteration and misbranding of vanilla extract. U. S. v. 366 Dozen and 218 Dozen Bottles of Vanilla Compound. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 17876. I. S. Nos. 8432-v, 8434-v. S. No. W-941.)

On October 26, 1923, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 584 dozen bottles of vanilla compound, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Oakland, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Heinrich Chemical Co. from Minneapolis, Minn., in part July 5, 1922, and in part July 21, 1923, and transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of California, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) "Heinrich's Compound of Vanilla, Vanillin and Coumarin * * * Heinrich Chemical Co." The article was shipped in cases a portion of which bore the statement: "Vanilla Compound From Heinrich Chemical Co. Minneapolis, Minn." and the remainder of which bore the statement: "Vanilla From Heinrich Chemical Co., Minneapolis, Minn."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that it was an imitation extract consisting of a hydroalcoholic solution of vanillin and coumarin, artificially colored, which had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for vanilla extract.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements "Vanilla Compound" or "Vanilla," as the case might be, appearing on the said cases and the statement "Compound of Vanilla, Vanillin and Coumarin," appearing on the said bottles, were false and misleading and deceived and misled the pur-